# LABOUR MONTHLY

A Magazine of International Labour

Editor: R. Palme Dutt

## British Labour and the World
R.P.D.

## Menace of Adenauer Germany
GORDON SCHAFFER

## Who is this Dulles?
PHILIP BOLSOVER

October, 1953

One shilling and sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WHICH WAY TO BEDLAM?

THOSE who profess to see in arguments for increased wages 'the Economics of Bedlam' become afflicted with blindness when invited to glance at increasing profits. It is a pity that one or two of the T.U.C. leaders going home from Douglas last month could not have travelled backward in time to just one hundred years ago and broken their journey at Preston. There they would have found themselves in a town where mill-owners had locked-out 20,000 textile workers for claiming the restoration of a 10 per cent. wage cut —the great Preston Lock-out of 1853. At the placarded street corners they could have read the employers' announcement that the trade could not bear more wages, and laying down the principle that no man thenceforth who belonged to a 'combination' would be employed in the mills. They could have read, too, the 'Notice By the Order of the Committee' addressed to 'Friends and Fellow-Operatives'; perhaps they would have paused at the passage recalling how the employers 'in times of good trade and general prosperity, wrung from their labour a California of gold, which is now being used to crush those who created it, still lower and lower in the scale of civilisation. This has been the result of our commercial prosperity! *more wealth for the rich and more proverty for the poor!* This system of giving everything to the few and nothing to the many, has lasted long enough. The task is before you, working men; if you think the good which would result from its accomplishment is worth struggling for, set to work and cease not, until you have obtained *the good time coming.*' Would the visitors from the Twentieth Century, I wonder, have handed a small contribution to the mill lassie collecting funds for the Power-Loom Weavers Committee, or the Spinners and Self-Actors Committee? At least they could have learnt from her whence profit comes and just whose are 'the Economics of Bedlam'.

What a heavy postbag we have been enjoying, on the eve of the Labour Party conference—readers have been enthusiastic about the articles and comments on the Labour Party programme now being discussed at Margate. An old friend who is a Ward secretary writes: 'Nothing but good can come from sensible discussion of the kind you are out to encourage in *L.M.*' Among those asking us to send specimen copies to friends, this is typical: 'Because *L.M.* is the best running commentary on affairs and the best political educator for the working man and woman that I know of. That's my judgment after 14 years solid reading, since I was 18!' A very active woman finds it 'ideal for socialistic-minded people. I've ordered it regularly through my newsagent and take every opportunity of introducing it to fellow-members of the Labour Party.' Another finds it useful 'to consult to clarify a knotty situation. Let us hope that greater unity will soon prevail in our movement.' Of keen interest to us, always ready to learn from readers, are suggestions and criticisms. A Londoner begins with congratulations 'on maintaining the very high standard through all these years—and as a matter of fact I think it has improved in the last year or so. The fly in the ointment is the price: I persuade people to buy copies but find it impossible to get them to part with the cash for a subscription.' He goes on to ask for a short summary of every National Election of major importance, as J. Platts-Mills did recently on Italy. 'Next, I think you have improved your cultural coverage and I enjoyed recent articles on Rabelais, the History of *The Times*, on the Artist and the Working Class. Some time ago you ran an appreciation

*(Continued on page iii of cover)*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXXV, No. 10

CONTENTS

October, 1953


| | Page |
|---|---|
| NOTES OF THE MONTH: British Labour and the World, by R.P.D. .. | 433 |
| THE THIRD WORLD CONGRESS OF TRADE UNIONISM, by Louis Saillant | 445 |
| MENACE OF ADENAUER GERMANY, by Gordon Schaffer .. .. | 450 |
| WHO IS THIS DULLES? by Philip Bolsover .. .. .. .. | 455 |
| CLASH AT THE T.U.C., by John Horner .. .. .. .. | 463 |
| STRIKES IN FRANCE, by Peter Fryer .. .. .. .. .. | 467 |
| ONCE MORE ON RICARDO, by R. Page Arnot .. .. .. .. | 472 |
| OBITUARY: THEODORE ROTHSTEIN .. .. .. .. .. | 462 |
| TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO .. .. .. .. .. .. | 471 |
| WOODCUT BY KU YUAN: The Working People's Palace of Culture .. | 456-457 |
| RANK-AND-FILE COMMENT .. .. .. .. .. .. | 476 |
| *Communication:* | |
| On Harry Quelch .. .. .. .. .. .. .. | 478 |
| *Book Review:* | |
| Byzantium, by Jack Lindsay: *Robert Browning* .. .. .. | 479 |


## Notes of the Month

# *British Labour and the World*

**'Labour's aim is economic strength and independence.**

**(a) To achieve political and economic independence Labour will break the reactionary alliance with capitalist America whilst making every effort to strengthen the ties with U.S. Labour.**

**(b) To break the stranglehold of British financial capital Labour will nationalise all major banks and monopolist combines of industrialists, thus giving Labour full control of financial policy both here and throughout the Colonies.**

**(c) Labour will withdraw all British troops from the colonies and assist in every way possible the Colonial workers in their struggle for democratic socialism'.**

**MANCHESTER, BLACKLEY Constituency Labour Party, Amendment to E.C. Programme 'Challenge to Britain'.**

THE great debate at Douglas and at Margate needs to be judged in the context of what is happening in the world. All the ferment and sharpening battle of policy within the labour movement is the reflection of the changed position of Britain in the world. It is the reflection of the fateful choice which now opens out before the British people. The policy of the past eight years,



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which has tied Britain to the American war chariot, in the vain hope to maintain the crumbling imperialist world monopoly, under conditions of subordination to the American warlords, against the rising tide of popular liberation, has ended in ruinous consequences for Britain. Economically the outlook is sombre. The burdens of a militarised economy depress the conditions of the people. The mad race of the American rulers to war arouses universal alarm. That a change of course is indispensable for Britain's survival is manifest to every serious observer.

**Lost Initiative**

The initiative of Churchill and Attlee last May began the first step to such a change. This initiative held out the prospect for Britain to break free from the American stranglehold and assume a leading world role for peace. New hopes were aroused throughout the world. But during these succeeding five months this initiative has been thrown away and trampled on and reversed under the leadership of Butler and Salisbury. The war trumpets are sounded anew by the sinister combine of Dulles, Adenauer and Rhee, and Britain stumbles feebly in the rear. And if we ask why this ground has been lost, and why this initiative has been stifled, the answer is inescapable. It is not merely because Tory reaction has once again stifled the Churchillian initiative, as in the days of Munich. This alone would not be decisive, any more than in the days of Munich, if Labour took the lead. The key responsibility lies with British Labour. The setback arises because British Labour, under its present leadership, has so far failed to rise to this new opportunity. Tory reaction clings to the old paths. Only a revitalised Labour movement can rally the nation to advance along the new course. The active rank and file membership more and more clearly understand this and press forward. But the hard core of the old reactionary right-wing leadership, entrenched in the Trades Union Congress General Council, and in the machine of the Labour Party, seek to apply the brakes. This is the significance of the developing battle which is of such decisive import, not only for the future of British Labour and of Britain, but for the whole world.

**The Hour of Truth**

As in the fateful months after Munich, the eyes of the nation are beginning to open, at the eleventh hour, to the bankruptcy of the old policies and to the real menace of world aggression. Three years ago Rhee could still be presented as the innocent victim of



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aggression, and Dulles as the knight-errant of collective security. Today Dulles and Rhee are seen by all as the firebrands and menace which they were in fact already when they hatched their war plot three years ago. The bitter truth has begun to seep through that Britain's sword was drawn three years ago, not against aggression, but on the side of the aggressors and invaders against a small people valiantly defending their national freedom, and that from that wrong decision much evil has flowed. Three years ago the Atlantic Pact could be presented as an instrument of defence, even though manifestly contravening the provisions of the United Nations Charter, against the supposed menace of a mythical onslaught which was proclaimed to be imminent and irresistible and which never transpired. Today the myth of that menace of attack is brazenly admitted by the staff chiefs themselves who shaped the Pact. Today the Atlantic Pact, and its accompanying American military occupation of Europe and revival of German militarism, is more and more clearly seen by ever wider numbers, no longer as the imaginary shield of defence, but as the source of menace, the resurrection of Hitler's Anti-Comintern Axis in the shape of Dulles' 'Liberation' crusade against the countries of socialism and popular democracy, and the instrument of American world domination, using Britain, France and Italy as pawns in the war game.

**Plans for War**

The outlines of the plans for war are sharp and inescapable. Alongside Rhee and Chiang in the Far East, there now stands also Adenauer, donning the armour of Hitler, and sounding the same call for the revival of German militarism to resume Hitler's 'march to the East' and 'liberate' the territories of Eastern Europe in order to win 'greater living room' for German imperialism. Rhee and his 'march to the North'. Chiang Kai-shek and his calls to invade China. Adenauer and his sacred mission to 'liberate' the East. And behind all three the figures of Dulles and Eisenhower, of Marshall and Gruenther and Radford and McCarthy; the gold and the steel, and the embattled array of the largest armed forces of any power on earth, spread over every continent, and proclaiming the manifest destiny of the American world mission. Such is the grim outline of the visible menace of the world situation today. Against this menace the peoples of Britain, of France, of Italy, of Europe, Asia and Africa are stirring. Fresh from his world tour, Adlai Stevenson, the Democratic party leader, proclaimed the warning lesson he had learned that the Allies of the American war coalition



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(his so-called 'free world') are growing fearful of American war aims:

> The rest of the free world is alarmed by the seeming American inflexibility. There is a suspicion that our objective is to exterminate Communism. But America's allies see little prospect of obliterating Communism except gradually or by war.
>
> And they do not want war.

This is the situation which throws opportunity and responsibility above all to Britain and to British Labour. No wonder the people of Britain have begun to stir uneasily. No wonder the Labour rank and file are in revolt.

**Peace or War in the Far East**

Consider the first immediate task of peacemaking today—to make peace in the Far East. The United Nations Assembly is due to meet to consider the Korean Conference and peace in the Far East. The Korean Conference is due to meet to prepare peace for the tortured land of Korea and prepare the way for peace throughout the Far East. But are either of these bodies allowed to function for peace or to fulfil the wishes of the majority of their members or of the nations concerned? The war will of the United States blocks the path at every point. First, the largest nation of the Far East and of the world is excluded from the supposed world assembly of the United Nations—because the United States does not like it. Next, the second largest nation of Asia and the world is excluded from this key Asian Conference—because the United States does not like it. No matter that the majority of the states and peoples of the world demand it. The supreme will of the world bully must be accepted—and Britain, in place of leading the majority of the world for peace, humbly bows to the dictator. By every means of pressure at its command the United States was only able to assemble the shaky representatives of governments covering one-seventh of the population of the world to back its insolent exclusion of India from the Korean Peace Conference. Six-sevenths of the population of the world wanted India. But the will of the one-seventh was proclaimed the decision of the United Nations. And even so the would-be dictators, in their anxiety to swing the decision against the majority, appear to have forgotten that the procedure and arrangements for a peace conference between two sides can only be settled by negotiation and agreement between both sides, and not by the unilateral decision and ultimatum of one side in isolation. The very conception of negotiation appears to have disappeared from the dictionary of American diplomacy.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**War by Ultimatum**

In this connection the warning words of the recent declaration from the World Peace Council are well worth taking to heart:

> The word 'negotiation' is too often being used to veil manoeuvres opposed to the peaceful settlement of international problems.
>
> It is not negotiation for one party to lay down conditions beforehand to another and to seek to prescribe to another the form and content of the negotiations in advance.
>
> To precede negotiations on Korea with a separate treaty with Syngman Rhee, who has not accepted the armistice, and exclude India from the political conference; to demand, before the starting of any negotiations on Germany, acceptance of the rebirth of German militarism, is to seek to make agreement impossible.

This warning goes to the heart of the question of war or peace. The elementary meaning of negotiation and diplomacy needs to be taught anew to the Foreign Offices of the West. Ever since the last genuine international conference of negotiation at Potsdam (and the Moscow Conference later in the same year) the method pursued during these eight years before every international gathering has been the prior ganging up of the Western powers to draw up terms and conditions as to an already vanquished adversary and present them at the subsequent conference as an ultimatum not subject to negotiation. If the ultimatum is rejected, the other party is declared to be 'obstructive'. This method has lain at the root of the worsening international situation during these eight years. The choice between the path of peace and the path of war has become plain and inescapable. The path of peace is the path of negotiation, as proposed by Churchill and Attlee last May—full, free, unfettered and informal negotiation in order to resolve differences. The path of war is the path of the ultimatum, the proclaiming of prior conditions, the demand to impose beforehand the will of one party, the method of the mailed fist, the method of Eisenhower and Dulles. Between these two paths the choice must be made.

**War Plans in the Far East**

What is especially serious in the present controversy over the Korean Political Conference is the manifest purpose of American aggressive strategy in blocking the participation of India in an Asian peace conference. For three years the machinery of the United Nations, which was created to maintain peace, has been misused to cover the most barbarious aggression and invasion by Western imperialism against a small Asiatic nation—the most barbarous, ruthless and destructive in the whole history of three centuries of Western



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imperialist aggression against Asia. Thanks to the heroic resistance of the Korean people, and the assistance of the Chinese volunteers, that aggression was defeated, though at a terrible cost, in face of the combined assault of the land, sea and air forces of all the imperialist powers and their reckless violation of all the laws of civilised warfare in their efforts to exterminate the civilian population. Only after the military fiasco of this aggression, and the manifest failure to destroy the Korean People's Republic and subjugate Korea as an American colony under the vassal Rhee, was an armistice at last, after two years' blocking of the original Soviet proposal for a cease-fire, grudgingly accepted. But the armistice has been immediately followed by the most openly bellicose declarations of Rhee, with powerful American backing, to renew the war at the earliest moment for the conquest of Korea. A military treaty and secret agreement has been drawn up between the United States and Rhee to wreck the peace conference within ninety days, if the ultimatum terms for the subjugation of Korea under Rhee are not accepted. In the event of the breakdown of the conference the threat has been held out, not only to renew the war, but to extend it beyond Korea. More serious still, the British Government has under-written this American strategy to extend the war beyond Korea. The significance of the determination to exclude India from the Peace Conference is sufficiently obvious in the face of these intentions. For the presence of India as a genuine neutral would have inevitably compelled the conference to take on the character of a conference for negotiation, in place of the plan for the presentation of an ultimatum in order to prepare breakdown and launch renewed war. To this infamous war plan Britain has now been heavily committed by the undertaking of the Tory Government. Such is the extreme gravity of the present situation in the Far East. The struggle for a peace settlement in Korea will be even more arduous than the prolonged struggle for an armistice. It can only be won by the most intensive mobilisation of the popular will for peace.

**'Deutschland Ueber Alles'**

And now Germany—the other prong of the American war offensive. It took fifteen years from the collapse of German militarism in 1918 before the same forces of the monopolists and militarists, thanks to the connivance of the Western powers, could gather themselves anew behind the figure of Hitler to threaten Europe once again. Now after the still more crushing defeat of 1945 only eight years of fostering with lavish American aid has built up anew the



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same forces of the Ruhr monopolists, the Krupps with their fortunes restored, the released war criminals and Nazi generals, around the figure of Adenauer, to proclaim again the rebuilding of German military power and the expansionist aims of German imperialism in Europe. Nothing was lacking in that festal celebration of the victory of Adenauer in the rigged election in Western Germany: the torchlight procession; the strains of 'Deutschland Ueber Alles'; and the voice of Adenauer proclaiming the aim, no longer to 'unify' but to 'liberate' (key code word of Dulles' aggressive aims) Eastern Germany, and giving the first hint of further expansionist objectives in the call for 'greater space' ('groesser Raum'—key code word of Hitler's aggressive programme in *Mein Kampf*) for Germany, and in the cool suggestion that Western Poland should become the object of a 'condominium'.

**Electoral Lessons**

There are important lessons to be learned from that rigged election in Western Germany. In the first place, it is significant that, in the now customary changing of the electoral law before each election in order to secure the desired result, it was the British electoral system which was chosen as the main model and highest example of an undemocratic electoral system, in order to defeat popular representation and impose the trick of the two-party system with identical basic policies. By this technique the miracle was achieved that in Western Germany of the Ruhr, of Hamburg, of the great industrial centres which for generations have been the strongholds of militant Marxism and Communism, not a single Communist representative could be returned to parliament. British militant workers can recognise the technique with a wry sympathy; and this example should knock a glimmer of understanding into the empty heads of the superficial ignoramuses who seek to prove the 'insignificance' of the Communist Party in Britain from its absence of parliamentary representation. But the most important lesson is the lesson of working-class unity. In Italy the Communist Party and the Socialist Party worked in co-operation; and the outcome was the defeat of De Gasperi, while both the Communist Party and the Socialist Party advanced in strength. In Western Germany the Social Democratic Party rejected every approach for a united front against Adenauer, and confused its own following with contradictory policy statements which combined bi-partisan support of the basic Atlantic Pact, remilitarisation and anti-Soviet policy of Adenauer with incoherent hints of possible variations. There is no



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

doubt that the overwhelming majority of the German people, who have had bitter experience of the catastrophic outcome of Hitler's 'March to the East', would have rallied to a united alternative programme for peace. But no such united alternative was presented to them in this election. In the outcome Adenauer won his absolute majority; while both the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Party went down in their proportion of the vote. There is a lesson here for us in Britain. That lesson demonstrates anew the indispensable need for unity around a positive alternative programme for the defeat of Toryism in Britain.

**American Jubilation**

There is no question of the reception which the grim portent of Adenauer has aroused in Europe—and in a contrary sense, in official circles in America. In the United States *The Times* correspondent reports the 'undisguised delight' in the White House and in the State Department, and describes 'the broad smile that has spread across the face of American officialdom'. Whereas in Italy the open intervention of Dulles helped to procure the downfall of De Gasperi, in Western Germany even the open intervention of Dulles and arrogant instructions to German electors did not prevent the return of Adenauer—a shocking example of the measure of political demoralisation spread by the present régime under American patronage in Western Germany. Indeed, a section of the American press smugly warned against too publicly proclaiming the return of Adenauer as an 'American victory' lest it play into the hands of his opponents:

> These elections constitute a victory for the United States and its foreign policy. . . . Satisfaction . . . should not be distorted into the kind of emotionalism that can make the Bonn Government appear an implement of American diplomacy. Such a development would actually weaken Adenauer and would cast a cloud over what should be the entirely brilliant prospect opened up by his victory.
>
> It will be best for Americans to think of the Adenauer triumph not as something they inspired or caused, but as a solid and heartening reality which their foreign policy can now take into account.
>
> (*New York Herald Tribune*, September 9, 1953.)

In other words, 'We did it of course, but don't say it too loud'. The ties between American and German finance-capital and militarism are undoubtedly very close, even closer than in the period of the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan and the building up of Hitler. But history can take many turns, as experience has shown; and the American imperialists may yet find, as Neville Chamberlain found



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

before them, that the Frankenstein's monster of resurrected German imperialism and militarism which they have so zealously worked to build up will prove a monster which has its own appetites and may rapidly reach out in directions not always calculated by them.

**Alarm in Europe**

Of the universal alarm in Europe there can be equally no question. The Paris *Monde* writes of the 'disquieting' character of Adenauer's declarations after the poll. The former Chairman of the French Foreign Affairs Commission, M. Bonnefous, warned:

> From the economic point of view Germany threatens to become an increasingly powerful rival on all markets. From an international point of view, if we are not careful, the danger will be . . . that, instead of integrating Germany in a newly formed Europe, we run the risk of seeing Europe built around Germany.

And the *Manchester Guardian* on September 8 commented:

> The thunder of Dr. Adenauer's triumph will be heard beyond Germany's borders—in Paris, for example, and at Lugano. To the French, the sound may be somewhat ominous. . . . Western Germany . . . is becoming the dominant nation of Western Europe.

Similarly the *Monde* of September 14:

> Political strength, industrial expansion, American alliance: these three factors will assure Germany of a dominating position in six-country Europe. France can only hope for the place of a brilliant second, the very position Pierre Laval dreamed of in Hitlerite Europe.

Also in London anxiety was reported by the *New York Herald Tribune* of September 11:

> The triumph of Chancellor Konrad Adenauer has not stirred quite as much exhilaration in London as it evidently has in Washington. The thing that is disturbing many officials here (London) is that France will become more nervous than ever over the prospect of Germany dominating Europe.

Not France only, but Britain also and all Europe has reason to see with alarm the American-fostered revival of German militarism and reaction in the heart of Europe. The British servile ratification of the Bonn Treaty is yielding bitter fruits.

**'The Times' Returns to Its Vomit**

But has the lesson been learned in British official quarters? The old tunes of the Munichite era are being played anew. Listen to *The Times* of September 11 on 'East-West Trade'. After the customary blind and blinkered dismissal of the prospects of trade with the mighty advancing non-dollar economies of one-third of the world as of insignificant importance for Britain (the Reports of the



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United Nations European Economic Commission have provided sufficient answer to that) *The Times* turns to its grand solution: let German economic expansion be directed to Eastern Europe:

> The advantages which world trade would derive from a re-opening of Germany's lost markets in Eastern Europe would be far greater. A revival of the natural exchange between the primary products of Eastern Europe and German manufactures would at once tap eastern resources more effectively and lessen the pressure of German exports elsewhere.

Back to the grand strategy of Schacht and Hitler. Back to the dreams of Halifax and Chamberlain to divert German expansion to the East. Fifteen years have passed since *The Times* wrote its Sudetenland article to betray Czechoslovakia to Hitler. History has moved since then. Great changes have taken place. *The Times* sleeps on. The old semi-colonial agrarian appendages of Western finance-capital in Eastern Europe, maintained under the corrupt satellite rule of feudal landlords and gangster dictators, have vanished for ever. Thanks to the aid of the Soviet Union, gigantic industrial development has transformed the economy of these countries and wiped out for all time the old colonial dependence. Trade has multiplied tenfold between the countries of socialism and people's democracy. The Old Blunderer remains mumbling the ancient Schachtian formulas. If the menace of German expansion (economic today—and military tomorrow) can be diverted to the East, these pedlars of illusions imagine Britain may escape. 1940 shattered that delusion. The weaker German imperialism dared not attack the East (and the disproportion is greater today) unless the West were first conquered. It is France and Britain that are immediately and directly in danger from the revival of German imperialism in Western Germany; and the offensive has begun in the world market.

**Where Stands Britain?**

It is time indeed to ask where Britain stands in this menacing world situation. After the lost initiative of last May never has British policy sunk to so low a level of servility and impotence as during these recent months under the rule of Butler and Salisbury. From the capitulation of Washington onwards the further descent has been precipitous. Britain fawns on Adenauer. The Anzus meeting, with the agreement of Australia and New Zealand, decides to maintain the exclusion of Britain. Britain tails behind the Dulles-Rhee Agreement, and signs the American-dictated undertaking to conduct new enlarged military hostilities in the Far East beyond the



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frontiers of Korea in the event of the negotiations breaking down and Rhee resuming his loudly proclaimed 'march to the North' as in 1950. The Government dare not even inform parliament of this secret commitment, and its announcement only follows after the adjournment of parliament. Britain surrenders to the United States on the vital question of the representation of China in the United Nations; and when the Soviet Union raises this just demand, which Britain is pledged to support, in the United Nations Assembly, it is the British delegate who performs the jackal's job of immediately seconding the United States delegate to defeat the proposal. Such is the depth of humiliation to which Tory reaction has reduced Britain, as in the days of Munich. Only the battle of the people can change this situation; and only a fighting labour movement can give effective expression to the will of the people for national independence and for peace.

**Signposts from Douglas**

The Douglas Trades Union Congress revealed the rising volume of demand throughout the labour movement for such leadership. Even the right wing dared not resist the unanimous adoption of the resolution of the Electrical Trades Union for Great Power negotiations 'without further delay', the call for the reduction of the period of military service, the repudiation of the wage-freeze and the demand for the restoration of food subsidies and cutting of purchase tax. But the main line of the dominant right wing continued, in the name of a blind and spurious 'economic realism', to maintain adherence to the American war policies which are bringing economic and military ruin for Britain, and to oppose every proposal which would threaten capitalist profits and ownership or Tory domination. Even a proposal for a campaign against the Tory Government was rejected. Nevertheless, the firm and unwavering volume of support for progressive policies, revealed in a consistent vote of from two and a half to three millions, did in fact demonstrate, not only the growth of the left and of unity of the left, but the precarious basis of the present right-wing policies, despite the bludgeoning tactics employed. The balance is shifting, in spite of all. The extreme right wing, still dominant, is moving still further to the right, even against the shadow of nationalisation and to half-concealed hostility to the Labour Party. But the main body of the movement is seeking for a forward policy, for peace and the improvement of living standards, for the defeat of Toryism and the advance to socialism.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Margate and After**

The battle goes forward to Margate. With the increasing sharpness of every present controversy, differentiation has begun to affect in varying degree the entire upper leadership. Even such a moderate supporter of the old policies as Mrs. Eirene White finds herself compelled to protest publicly against the bludgeoning tactics of the extreme right wing in control of the machine. Even Mr. Attlee, brought publicly under fire from the same extreme right wing, finds himself compelled, not only to criticise publicly American policy and the Government's subservience, but to answer the charge that he is 'anti-American' and 'pro-Communist'. The healthy feeling of the active rank and file is abundantly demonstrated in the final agenda, with the overwhelming volume of amendments against—for they can only be called amendments against rather than amendments to—the ignominious official draft programme *Challenge to Britain*. The present paralysis and division of leadership within the labour movement is dangerous in the extreme; for it plays into the hands of Toryism, and means abdication at the very moment when Labour should lead the nation. But the solution of this crisis of policy and leadership, and the advance to a positive policy and programme can only come from the united progressive forces of the labour movement which are seeking to respond to the urgent needs of the present hour and open the way to future victory. The battle goes forward at Margate, and beyond Margate; for this battle carries with it the future of British Labour and of Britain at a moment when the role of Britain can be of decisive importance for the victory of peace throughout the world.

*September 16, 1953.* R.P.D.

LABOUR MONTHLY BY AIRMAIL: *To non-European countries (including Hongkong) except as below, post free: Single copy 4s. 6d.; a year's subscription 54s.*

*To China (except Hongkong), Australia, New Zealand, Japan and the Philippines, post free: Single copy 5s.; a year's subscription 60s. To Aden, Algeria, Egypt, Iran, Iraq and Syria, post free, 4s. per copy; a year's subscription 48s.*



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE 3rd WORLD CONGRESS OF TRADE UNIONISM

LOUIS SAILLANT*

IN 1945 it was decided that the World Trade Union Congress should meet periodically. This decision was accepted by all trade union organisations represented at the World Trade Union Conference held again in Paris in the autumn of that year. The decision, having thus received the unanimous approval of trade unions in countries with very diverse political, economic and social systems, such as Great Britain and the U.S.S.R., France and India, Italy and China, was incorporated into the statutes of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

In 1953 the World Trade Union Congress is to meet again. In conformity with the decision of its founders in 1945, this will be a *World* Congress: it will include delegates representing trade union organisations from countries in Africa, America, Asia, Australasia and Europe, whatever their political and economic status. We regret that international trade union division does not at present permit an even larger gathering. The Third World Trade Union Congress will meet in Vienna in October.

It meets at the right time. Such a gathering has become a necessity. The time has come for such a responsible body to examine the present state of the economic, social and political problems that arose out of the second world war. The time has also come to answer the question: 'How far are the trade unions throughout the world achieving their respective programmes?'

Already a lively interest is being taken in the activities of the coming meeting of the World Trade Union Congress. For more than five months numerous trade unions have been preparing for it in their own countries. Extremely interesting preparatory meetings were held during the summer in Brazil, Chile, Uruguay, Guatemala, India, Ceylon, Indonesia, Lebanon and in Equatorial and Western Africa. It will be the first time in these countries that trade unions have prepared for an International Congress on the basis of the immediate activities and social interests of their membership. In other countries too preparatory meetings are being held as I write.

*Louis Saillant, as many of our readers will know, has been secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions since its formation.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

By rule, the Third Trade Union Congress is open to all trade unions taking a *bona fide* decision to be represented. Nor does representation at this Congress necessarily imply affiliation to the World Federation of Trade Unions. We are thus looking forward to a great meeting of international organised labour. It was the World Federation of Trade Unions which took the initiative in calling this meeting, and the organisation of a gathering of this kind is well in keeping with the role of the W.F.T.U. Our principal objective, when we founded the W.F.T.U. in 1945, was to facilitate such gatherings, and by this means to make possible an exchange of experiences between trade unions whose activities take place in differing circumstances according to the economic, social and political structure of their countries.

Our aim was also, on the basis of the necessary consultations, exchanges and studies, to evolve the general lines of an economic and social programme common to trade unions throughout the world. However complex and difficult this may be, given the present position of international trade unionism, it is the duty of the Third World Trade Union Congress to carry it through. During the eleven days that the Congress will be sitting, delegates will have to devote much time and work to the fulfilment of this most important of all tasks. They can and must succeed.

In order to succeed, they must constantly keep in mind the present needs of the workers and the most urgent desire of the peoples. Today the immediate need of workers everywhere is the improvement of their standard of life and of their conditions of work. The most ardent desire of the peoples is to obtain a guarantee of world peace.

How can the Third World Trade Union Congress help the workers to satisfy these vital needs and help the peoples to live in the assurance that world peace will be safeguarded? The assistance that the Congress can render in this respect will depend on the approach of the delegates to the outstanding, the dominant question, the question of unity of action among the workers, good understanding and friendship between the peoples.

This outstanding question must be approached with great objectivity. The present position of international trade unionism is more favourable than in 1949, (the year of the split in world trade unionism decided upon by the leaders of the American C.I.O. and of the British T.U.C. in agreement with the leaders of the A.F. of L.)



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but strenuous efforts are still needed in order to enable national and international trade union bodies to play a more effective role in the promotion of social progress and to stimulate cordial and friendly relations between the peoples, without discrimination of any kind.

The question of wages is on the order of the day for all trade unions. The study of this question will reveal what has been done, or left undone, for the promotion of social progress. From documentary reports sent by trade unions to the W.F.T.U. in advance of the Congress, it is clear that the purchasing power of wages has gone down in many countries in these last few years. Only a simpleton would fail to notice that meanwhile the employers' profits have steadily gone up. Those in the trade unions who spoke of equality of sacrifice to justify the wage-freeze have never uttered a clear explanation of the social inequality, increased by the policy followed under the auspices of the Marshall Plan. Keeping silence, however, has not disposed of the urgency of a general improvement in wages claimed by workers in Rio de Janeiro, Bombay, Tokyo, Rome, Paris, London, as well as in Pittsburg and Detroit.

Hence it is to be hoped that the Third World Trade Union Congress will clarify the position that the trade unions should take in order to provide the help and support that the workers expect from them. The depreciation of the real value of wages must be ended. This demand keeps coming up at trade union meetings, more often than any other. It is true for the trade unions affiliated to the W.F.T.U. in Western countries, and the same demand is more and more often heard at the meetings of unions not affiliated to the W.F.T.U.

This places on the W.F.T.U. the responsibility to speak and act—as it spoke and acted at the Sixteenth Session of the Economic and Social Council of U.N.O.—in the name of the workers, no matter what their international trade union affiliation. It is not the function of the W.F.T.U. to throw a modest veil over the economic claims put forward by the workers. On the contrary, it is its duty to make them known and to put them forward. The employers, and the governments at their service, have means enough at their disposal for trying to stifle the voice of the workers and their demands. It is the duty of the trade unions not to provide them with more of these means. This last idea will not be new in the discussions at Vienna next month. It is already very popular in factories, dockyards and other places of work. Should there or should there not



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be a balance-sheet of the results of the Marshall Plan in relation to the aims of the trade unions and the needs of the workers? Those who in 1948-49 argued that the split in international trade unionism was justified by their desire to facilitate American aid to Europe have not summed up the results of their action and of this strange co-operation, after the official termination of the Marshall Plan in 1952. Their uneasiness is understandable, their silence a little less so: have not their trade union members the right to some explanation? In this connection also one must be very naive to imagine that the slogan of 'Produce more!' can take the place of an objective judgment on the fabulous moneymaking by businessmen through the operation called 'American Economic Aid', a genuine enough 'Aid' to enable them to pile up their profits. We have no reason to be silent on this subject at the Third World Trade Union Congress. The great strikes of last August in France show that the French workers—whether affiliated to the W.F.T.U., the I.C.F.T.U. or the Christian International—know how to speak and act in unity regarding the social consequences of this very same policy. Which is very encouraging.

The consequences of the split in international trade unionism are as damaging to those who brought it about as are the consequences of their adherence in 1948 to the policy of American intervention in the economic and political affairs of so many countries. But 1953 is not the time to go into the history of the split. What must be done is to find the way to advance on the road to unity and restore the 1945 situation of international trade unionism. First and foremost it is necessary to bring an end to the rupture in relations between the representative national trade union bodies in many countries.

It is good to know that the 85th Annual Meeting of the T.U.C. has come out in favour of a conference between the four Great Powers. This corresponds to the desire of the peoples. The one essential is to go to such conferences with the intention of seeking negotiated agreements on the questions in dispute. The worst possible approach would be to create the impression that one agrees to negotiate, whereas it has already been decided to impose conditions and not to negotiate at all. Let us allow that it is not in this negative spirit that the majority of the General Council of the T.U.C. is accepting in 1953, on the subject of international relations, what the majority of the Executive Committee of the I.C.F.T.U. does not accept . . . or not yet.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many people in the international trade union movement are saying that such meetings between the representatives of governments would benefit if they were preceded by consultative and friendly meetings between trade unions of the countries concerned. This is very sensible. In any case, since I believe that it is possible to avoid war, I think that we are approaching the time when contact must be re-established between the national trade union organisations so that they can contribute—modestly at first but more fully later on—to the creation and consolidation of a better atmosphere in international relations. Of course, such an action must be voluntary and free.

A Consultative Conference of World Trade Unions should meet periodically, by common agreement between the W.F.T.U. the I.C.F.T.U. and the Christian International, without harming any of these three organisations. The object? To exchange information on trade union achievements and to preserve fraternal relations between the peoples, on the basis of their trade organisations, in order to serve the cause of peace and social progress.

The workers are aware that, for at least three months every year, representatives of governments meet in the General Assembly of the United Nations. They regret that the representative of the Chinese People's Republic has not yet been admitted. They are right in asking why, under other conditions and in other forms, representatives of trade unions of all countries do not similarly meet. Would it be more difficult for the representatives of trade unions to meet than it is for representatives of governments? This would be a sign of great weakness, not of any particular trade union organisation, but of the trade union movement in general.

Will such questions be examined and studied by the 700 delegates at the Third World Trade Union Congress? This is very likely.

Let us not forget that in the development of international trade unionism in the last five years, a whole series of events has proved that wherever trade unions have met with difficulties the origin of these difficulties was to be found in the division among the workers. Wherever important advances have been made, they have been due largely to the unity of the workers and of their trade unions. This lesson must be kept in mind at international level. This is why at the Third World Trade Union Congress the main question will be that of unity.

*Vienna, September 13, 1953.*



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# MENACE OF ADENAUER GERMANY

GORDON SCHAFFER

'Our Premier has no principles, but he has intuitions. And if his instinct tells him that the British people are absolutely resolute for peace, he will change his policy in a moment of time.

It is the task of the English people to make the Premier forget the diplomats and remember democracy.'

THE words might have been written today. They were in fact written on July 7, 1920. They were applied to Mr. Lloyd George who being forced by the logic of events to call off the war of intervention against the young Soviet Republic. The paper in which they appeared was the *Daily Herald*. In those days the Labour and trade union movement was pushing the Prime Minister into action; today, trade union and Labour leaders and their newspaper fight a rear-guard action in favour of cold war and trade embargoes when even the Tory Prime Minister and the City of London are beginning to yield to the logic of history.

But the pattern of events is the same. In 1920 Denikin, Wrangel, and the other White Guard Generals backed by interventionist forces of 14 nations had been fought to a standstill in Russia, just as the forces of Syngman Rhee and the interventionist forces of 16 nations have been fought to a standstill in Korea. Then the demands of the British working class for peace and friendship found expression in the Councils of Action; today the same demands are put forward by the Peace Movement. Then, the Labour Party and the T.U.C. were reluctantly forced to accept the policy of the Councils of Action, while repudiating its leaders. Today the peace movement is persecuted, but its key policy of great power negotiations is accepted by the Trades Union Congress. Then, as now, many business men were willing to put trade before political prejudices. In 1920, the British Secret Service printed bogus copies of *Pravda* in an effort to stir up hostility to the Soviet government. Today the United States government allocates 100 million dollars for similar activities.

After the collapse of the war of intervention in 1920, Britain and other countries were forced to accept the existence of one sixth of the world outside the orbit of capitalism and imperialism. They



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had to trade with this part of the world to save their own economies. But they never gave up. They built a *cordon-sanitaire* of hostile states round the Soviet Union. They broke the Treaty of Versailles to make possible the rearming of Germany as a 'bulwark against Bolshevism'. They used the links of the international cartels to facilitate the rebuilding of German armies and the war machine of the Ruhr. They encouraged Japan to attack China as a stepping stone to war against the Soviet Union. And in the end Hitler attacked France and Britain, while Japan turned on the United States.

We must understand that background if we are to see the real meaning of that scene at Bonn on September 7, the morning after the elections in West Germany, when Adenauer, darling of the American State Department, took over the role of Hitler. Adenauer is back as the 'bulwark against Bolshevism'. He is to be re-armed as Hitler was re-armed, to supply the cannon fodder for the next stage of the war of intervention.

How is it conceivable that eight years after the collapse of Nazi Germany, eight years after the British, United States, and Soviet leaders had re-affirmed at Potsdam their united determination to destroy Nazism, Adenauer is ready to start again where Hitler left off? How is it possible that after the fiasco of the last time, the *Economist* (September 12), is able to declare, 'Dr. Adenauer is established as the most powerful statesman on the Continent. . . . All the portents suggest that for some time to come Western Europe will be led by the German nation. . . . Dr. Adenauer will not be likely to tolerate tutelage in internal German affairs, and he will give increasingly forceful expression to the German view on European defence and economic collaboration'?

The answer is that these developments followed inexorably from the abandonment by the allies of the policy of Potsdam. Public opinion forced the Western Powers to announce their determination to destroy Fascism. They did not want to. Moore Brabazon, at the moment the Russians were holding the front line of civilisation, expressed their real hopes when he said he would like to see Germany and Russia destroying each other. Truman did the same when he said that if more Russians than Germans were being killed America should help the Russians, and if more Germans than Russians were being killed, she should help the Germans. Trade union leaders in Britain like Mr. George Gibson, and Mr. Charles Dukes reflected the same policy when they backed the Vansittartists



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for by so doing they sought to deny the war against Fascism and turn it into a war against all Germans, fascist or anti-fascist. Very soon after the Potsdam agreement was signed the Western powers were faced with the dilemma that Nazism could be destroyed only by destroying the economic basis on which it was built. To remove Nazis from industrial and political power meant turning to the anti-fascists, above all to the communists. To break up the cartels, meant nationalisation of industry, and in the hands of genuine anti-fascists, that would have meant laying the foundations of Socialism. To break up the great landed estates meant another step towards breaking the power not only of the Nazis, but of capitalism.

Yet all these measures were pledged in the Potsdam agreement. The signal to break these pledges came in Churchill's Fulton speech of March, 1946, and in his next speech at Zurich when he called for an alliance against Russia of France and Germany. The supreme betrayal was not in the Fulton speech for Churchill was already repudiated by the British electorate; it was in the deliberate refusal of the Labour government to repudiate the Fulton policy. From that time events in Germany have marched step by step to the finale of September 7. I wrote an article in those early days when Mr. John Hynd was Minister in Charge of German Affairs giving details of how the Nazis were being restored. Mr. Hynd was furious, and sent for me to deny my report. But when he checked up he found it was true. Today, it is accepted as a matter of course that in the Bonn Republic those who hold Nazi cards are eligible for high office, while anti-fascists are persecuted.

The cartels were restored. The American who was placed in charge of decartelisation, James Stewart Martin, has told the story of that betrayal with a wealth of detail in his book *All Honorable Men*. Land Reform was abandoned. British military government vetoed measures of nationalisation passed by Provincial German Parliaments. At the moment when a four power committee had reached agreement on all-German currency reform, General Clay, United States Commander in Chief, forced unilateral currency reform in Western Germany thereby precipitating Russian measures to protect Eastern Germany, and providing the excuse for the air lift. John Foster Dulles on his own admission in a speech in Paris advocated the prolonging of the air lift until the Western nations accepted the United States' demands for re-armament. The World Federation of Trade Unions was split after it had gone on record in favour of building a united German Trade Union Movement.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And on the other side of the world the China Lobby moved into action to stop Acheson carrying out his promise to restore Formosa to China and to prevent him following Britain in recognising People's China. The McCarthy witch-hunt was used to discredit all in the State Department who were willing to accept the Chinese People's victory. Foster Dulles (who had never disguised his sympathy for the Nazis in the pre-war years) was forced into the Truman administration as bi-partisan adviser on Foreign affairs and with General MacArthur, and Syngman Rhee started the Korean war as the first phase in the new war of intervention. With tragic irony, millions of sincere men and women were persuaded by propaganda (which all the evidence now disproves) into believing that in Korea they were supporting collective security against aggression.

It is equally ironical that the real truth has now been proclaimed by Mr. C. R. Attlee whose government backed the Korean war. He gave a warning in the last big debate on foreign affairs about the activities of the Chiang Kai-shek Lobby in the United States and he denounced the section in America which wants 'all out war against Communism'. The difference between Mr. Attlee and those of us who opposed the foreign policy of his government and the present Labour Party policy of backing the cold war is that we are convinced the section in America which wants all out war against Communism has been dictating the policy of the Western Powers from the beginning.

(If I had the space I could prove this contention from the wealth of American documents now available.)

What of the future? History does not repeat itself. The Germany of 1953, is not the Germany of 1933. One third of Germany has taken the path set out in the Potsdam agreement. The German Democratic Republic has passed through difficult times. It did not have the dynamic of a social revolution from below but its people have learned from their experience. They have made too great progress for further attempts at United States intervention like that of June 17, to succeed. Their living standards will rise steadily; in Federal Republic for all the facade of prosperity, the conditions of the people grow worse. The mass of the people in Western Germany in the main accept the anti-Soviet propaganda which the Western Powers took over from Dr. Goebbels, but they also meet every day a far more powerful propaganda. They see in their devastated towns the reality of war. Hardly a family was



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spared from the losses of Hitler's adventure. They know that re-armament is designed by the Americans as the prelude to civil war, and a new war against the land which smashed Hitler's armies.

The countries of Western Europe have also learned. France knows that if the Americans have their way, and make Western Germany the most powerful military power in Europe, they will be faced with a demand for the return of the Saar, and almost certainly Alsace Lorraine as well. Britain, which under Chamberlain's leadership sent Lord Halifax to bargain with Goering for the abandonment of Germany's claim to colonies in return for British agreement to the German drive Eastwards must know that a re-armed Western Germany will demand Lebensraum in the colonial world.

Adenauer's return is a setback for the forces of peace, but it is not defeat. He has already exposed the real plans of the interventionists. Millions in the Western world who were led along the path of a new war of intervention know now that they must be in the wrong camp if they have to accept the Nazi Generals, Franco, Syngman Rhee, and Chiang Kai-shek as their allies. They know too, that the campaign to build up new armies of intervention began in the years when America thought it had the monopoly of the atom bomb. Today Churchill has declared that a new war would bring immeasurable catastrophe to both sides. In 1920, it was mainly those who sought to save the Socialist revolution who stopped the war of intervention: today the whole of mankind is involved in the struggle because the issue is life and death for us all. The Socialist revolution which now embraces 800 million men and women can never be destroyed. The task of the world peace movement is to isolate the minority mainly in America who plan war, and who would commit suicide and drag their dupes with them, just as Hitler committed suicide. For the moment, they can celebrate their victory in Western Germany, but in the end it will recoil on them, for more and more their policy is exposed before the world.

LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *United Kingdom, 12 months, 18s. post free; $3.00 in U.S.A. and Canada ($3.50 if first class mail); elsewhere overseas, 19s. post free.*



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WHO IS THIS DULLES?

PHILIP BOLSOVER

JOHN FOSTER DULLES, America's Secretary of State, is a phenomenon worth close study. For in all post-war affairs there has been no other man so typical of the forces he has been chosen to represent. In Mr. Dulles is crystallised the essence of U.S. imperialism. He is the perfect specimen; here the political and financial aspects of American capitalism meet and are typified. There are some people who, reading the speeches of Dulles, noting the crudity of his pronouncements, recognising his apparent diplomatic blunders, think the man is stupid. But he is not stupid. He is the personification of the forces behind him in Wall Street and Washington—and if he is crude it is because they also are crude. But they are none the less menacing. Dulles is a mixture of over-confidence, arrogance—and fear. These traits, combined with a plentiful measure of hate, are the mark of the bully. And the United States is today the world bully. Dulles is over-confident and arrogant because American capitalism is over-confident in its apparent strength and riches. But at the heart of this loud-voiced confidence is a gnawing anxiety that the strength may prove insubstantial, that the riches may fade; and that the reality of these things may, in fact, already have passed elsewhere—to the Socialist countries. Such fears carry hatred.

Consider the record of Dulles even during the few weeks of August and early September. Support for Syngman Rhee's threat to 'march north' in Korea . . . the repeated statement that America is ready to start a war against China either in Korea or Indo-China . . . the demand for a revision of the United Nations Charter that would turn the whole organisation into an alliance of anti-Soviet states . . . the notorious intervention in support of Adenauer in the West German elections . . . the declaration that Japan is not spending enough on rearmament . . . the railing against India for her attitude to Korea. . . . It is the record of only a short period. But it reveals in essence all the characteristics of American imperialism—the fear and hatred of Socialism in the threats to China; the war plans concealed behind the proposal for a revision of United Nations Charter; the arrogance in the German and Japanese interventions.

We need not be surprised to find these facts illustrated so vividly, so terribly, in the activities of Mr. Dulles. Because, in fact, they



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# *From People's China*

The Working People's Palace of Culture, Peking

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Woodcut by *Ku Yuan*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be traced through his whole career. John Foster Dulles was born in 1888, the son of a family long accustomed to power and influence in American society. Four years before he was born his grandfather, John W. Foster, became Secretary of State under President Benjamin Harrison. Later his uncle, Robert Lansing, was to be Secretary of State under Woodrow Wilson.

Family influence hoisted him into a number of minor government posts during the first world war, while the influence of his uncle and his friend President Wilson took him to the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919. By that time he was a rising star in the Wall Street firm of Cromwell and Sullivan, America's most powerful and influential firm of corporation lawyers, allied to the Rockefellers. Powerful backing took him to Versailles. But he earned his keep. This was virtually the opening of his career as a direct political-financial representative of U.S. capitalism in international negotiations. His political associations and his growing financial experience under the Rockefellers combined to make him the principal American spokesman on the Reparations Commission. Later, he helped through the Dawes and Young plans to rebuild the German steel, chemical and other cartels, and through them to increase U.S. financial influence in Germany.

By 1922 Dulles was a partner in Cromwell and Sullivan. There are 20 partners in that huge firm; they hold 40 important directorships linking the firm with banks, industrial corporations and public utilities worth many millions. Dulles, specialising in international law, public finance and the representation of major U.S. investors abroad, eventually became head of the firm and a millionaire. His part in rebuilding the German cartels was followed by the negotiation of aid for Pilsudski's fascist Poland, for Horthy's fascist Hungary, for Franco's fascist Spain, and later for Hitler's Nazi Germany. A former American Ambassador to Germany, William E. Dodd, once wrote in his diary, later published, that American financial interests, and particularly the Rockefellers, had a hand in Hitler's rise to power. He was undoubtedly referring to the activities of Dulles. Dulles has continued his association with the fascists of Europe and the militarists of Japan. Today he seeks to revive them. He seeks to rebuild a reactionary Germany and turn its power to the east; that is what Neville Chamberlain once tried to do—Mr. Dulles should remember the result.

Since 1944, Dulles has been chief foreign policy spokesman of the Republican Party. As adviser to the Truman Government his



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

influence survived that of four Democratic Secretaries of State before he himself took the job over under Eisenhower. He did not attend the Yalta and Potsdam conferences where the unity of Britain, America and the Soviet Union reached its peak. But he *did* take a prominent part in the foundation meeting of the United Nations at San Francisco in 1945, when the first big breach in the wartime grand alliance occurred. He *did* attend the series of meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers where the wartime alliance was destroyed. And he *did*, even at the founding of U.N. show his lack of faith in that organisation by declaring that it would be even weaker than the old League of Nations. In the Far East he was an ardent supporter of General MacArthur and Chiang Kai-shek. He negotiated the Japanese peace treaty in such a way as to make Japan a U.S. military base.

Mr. Dulles is an energetic man. Despite his foreign adventures, he has found time for activities at home—and they have not been confined to the bird-watching and wood-cutting of which he likes to talk. His work as a lawyer brought him at one time an income of 150,000 dollars a year. Directorships of the Bank of New York, International Nickel Corporation, American Agricultural Chemical Corporation and others, as well as his widespread associations through Sullivan and Cromwell, kept him closely in touch with the highest circles of U.S. finance and industry. He and his wife were financial supporters of the pro-fascist America First Committee, and the incorporation papers of the New York branch were drawn up in his office.

What has he said? One might reply that of late he has said far too much for the comfort of State Department officials. Once people used to say that after hearing some of the many Dulles speeches one could form new standards of comparison—dull, duller, Dulles. But now they are beginning to use the old gibe that every time he opens his mouth he puts his foot in it. His more incautious remarks indicate with clarity the forces he represents. In March, 1939, seeking to damp down the rising opposition to Axis war preparations, he declared: 'Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy or Japan contemplates war against us'. Again, in 1939, he said of the fascist countries:

> These dynamic peoples are determined to mould their States into a form which would permit them to take their destiny into their own hands and to attain that enlarged status which under a liberal and peaceful form of government has been denied them.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1945 he welcomed the breach in East-West relations that occured at the Council of Foreign Ministers' meeting in London. His remark was significant, for it indicated how ill at ease he and the people he represents had been during the wartime alliance with the Soviet Union. The London conference, he said, had 'revealed difficulties of long standing which the war had obscured'.

By 1951 he was demanding a 'powerful striking force' able to 'hit at Russia's interior lines of communication with such disruptive power that its highly centralised State will fall apart'. In February, 1952, he declared:

> I think that in the long run you cannot keep an absolute barrier between Japan and the mainland, and the solution which we ought to seek, and which the Japanese would like to join with us in seeking, is to change the character of the mainland.

In August, 1952, he said the United States should work for 'the disintegration of Soviet Communism from within'. In the same year he wrote into the Republican Party's election programme a passage calling for the 'liberation' of the Socialist countries—a passage so revealing that it was eventually dropped.

Just occasionally, however, very occasionally, the bitter and sterile poverty of the policy he and American imperialism represent has penetrated briefly to the place where Dulles should keep his soul. One such moment occurs in his book *War or Peace,* written in 1950.

> Something, he wrote, has gone wrong with our nation. . . . The trouble is not material. . . . What we lack is a righteous and dynamic faith. Without it all else avails us little. The lack cannot be compensated for by politicians, however able; or by diplomats, however, astute; or by scientists, however inventive or by bombs, however powerful.

From the beginning of his career, Dulles has been used by American capitalism as a controller of the flow of American dollars to and from all parts of the world. This has meant a continuous attempt to influence the policies of foreign governments—to create situations in which dollars make profits and multiply.

Today Dulles, as Secretary of State, is intent on three immediate objectives, all of which follow logically from the rest of his career:

1. To rearm Western Germany and create the so-called European Defence Community, with a rearmed Germany as its central, dominating factor, using this to attack or blackmail the Soviet Union and the East European democracies.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

2. To rebuild and rearm Japan as the main base for American imperialism in the Far East, particularly against People's China. At the same time, to use Chiang Kai-shek for provocative actions and military adventures on the Chinese mainland.

3. To organise spying, sabotage and provocations in the Socialist countries, with the aid of the 100 million dollar fund provided by the U.S. Congress.

In all these things he continually attempts to involve this and other countries, the latest example being his effort to commit us to a renewal of the war in Korea and its extension to China. Yet the arrogance, the greed for power and the recklessness of American imperialism which is reflected in Dulles and his policy continually breeds antagonisms on the part of other countries. The more obvious of these have already been indicated.

The U.S. policy towards Chiang Kai-shek and People's China is a constant source of friction between Britain and America. Britain has ancient economic ties with China, and she cannot afford to lose the great and expanding market there. Again, the economic and military resurrection of Germany and Japan under U.S. tutelage is an ever-increasing economic and political threat to Britain. Further, the military pact between America, New Zealand and Australia, shutting out Britain, has split Empire policy and strategy in the Far East. Dulles is himself conscious of the weaknesses of the American position. In *War or Peace* he wrote a significant passage:

> Abroad, our foreign policies can be implemented only by money and goods. These are limited; and because they are limited our policies are limited. Limited policies inevitably are defensive policies, and defensive policies inevitably are losing policies.

Here, in fact, is the dilemma of the imperialist bully who bribes and blackmails, cajoles and threatens—but still is weak at heart because he has no true friend, and is indeed surrounded by hate. The policy represented by Dulles is menacing and dangerous. But it meets increasing difficulties. We have many opportunities to multiply those difficulties, to strengthen the growing opposition, and we should take care to lose not one of those opportunities; for on them our lives and the lives of millions may depend.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THEODORE ROTHSTEIN

*Theodore Rothstein, an old supporter and contributor to 'Labour Monthly', died in Moscow on August 30, aged 82. In a note on the 30th anniversary of 'Labour Monthly' he spoke of himself as 'an old Communist, closely connected in the past with the socialist movement in Britain', and went on to congratulate ' "Labour Monthly", so ably and bravely in face of tremendous difficulties conducted by you and your associates. May your further indomitable efforts substantially contribute to the early and complete triumph of the cause of peace and national independence, forming as this struggle does a primary and essential part of the glorious fight for Labour's political, economic and social emancipation'.*

*He joined the Social Democratic Federation in 1895, challenging Hyndman's jingo policies during the Boer War and again in 1911-14. He played a big part in the development of the revolutionary Socialist movement in the 1914-18 war, with his writings in the weekly 'Call' under the names of John Bryan and W.A.M.M. He also played a leading part in the formation of the Communist Party in 1920.*

*When in 1920 he returned to Russia (in which he had been born) for the first time in 30 years, the Foreign Office took advantage of a technicality to exclude him from Britain. After a few months spent on reforming the Universities, he was appointed Minister to Iran. Of his numerous writings perhaps the most remarkable are 'Egypt's Ruin' (published in 1911) and 'From Chartism to Labourism' (1930).*



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# CLASH AT THE T.U.C.

JOHN HORNER

THE growing opposition to the Tory Government's attacks in successive budgets on working-class standards, the determination that Britain shall free itself from its bullying overlord, America, the demand to end the shameful Korean war once and for all, and the hope inspired by the Soviet peace initiative, have in recent months created a veritable ferment in the working-class movement. Why was this rising feeling not fully mirrored in the decisions of this year's T.U.C.? Of course progressive decisions were taken: for a cut in the call-up, for the restoration of social services, for Big-Power Talks. But it was at this Congress that the right-wing leaders put off their threadbare guise of 'socialism' and showed themselves, as the *Economist* kindly understated it 'as nearer to the left wing (*left* wing indeed!) of the Conservative Party' than to the 'socialist theory' of Labour.

It was at Douglas that Messrs. Deakin, Williamson and Lawther set out to establish themselves as the saviours of British capitalism in crisis. An exaggeration? Examine their attitude to social ownership—to the fundamental principles of Labour theory. Defeated last year, the General Council this time was determined to make no mistake. The tactics of discussion were firmly under their control. The Interim Report, of some 30,000 words, had been described by *The Times* as 'in wording and format akin to a Treasury document on Britain's economic ills'. Mr. Geddes spoke for the General Council, seeking to rout both the socialist critics and the Tory supporters of the Report. He declared that everyone had misunderstood it. It really was 'the green light for Socialism'. Mr. Geddes talked about many things, but he certainly did not appear to be talking about this particular Report. Three speakers alone from the floor of Congress could be found to defend the General Council's proposition that only water supplies were ripe for nationalisation! And as these delegates mounted to the rostrum, lo and behold, it turned out that they themselves were members of the General Council!

It is little wonder that after such speeches, and in the face of such a report, many delegates were confused. Subsequently, of course, an attempt was made to clear up the mystery of the minority vote by which Congress adopted the Report. Sir Vincent Tewson said



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that he had set afoot what he called a 'private enquiry', as to the reason for the large number of apparent abstentions. He told Congress that he learnt that the vote of 'a large Union which I shall not name, but which has a voting power of 1,277,000 was not recorded'. To mocking cat-calls from delegates, the card-holder for the Transport and General Workers' Union went to the rostrum, to declare 'I want to put myself in the clear. I have held up my card on every occasion'. One waggish delegate declared that he would write the story of 'Arthur's Missing Million'.

The fact that the General Council made public in such a humiliating fashion their anxiety at the luke-warm manner in which Congress had accepted their wet blanket on public ownership clearly indicated their fears for the forthcoming Labour Party Conference at Margate. Equal confusion reigned on the question of East-West trade. Here again, following last year's Congress resolution, the General Council had had twelve months in which to prepare another wordy, tendentious, inaccurate Report, which claimed to support 'every reasonable effort to extend East-West trade'. But in the words of the General Council speaker, they were determined that this should not be made a 'propaganda issue', whatever that might mean. Thus the straightforward resolution moved by the Foundry Workers for 'unrestricted world trade, including trade with the Soviet Union, China and the countries of Eastern Europe' was—by the complicated procedure of Congress—taken as an amendment to the Report. Those outside the hall might well be forgiven if they found it difficult to understand such a process.

Delegates had to listen to the sophistries of Mr. Sam Watson, on behalf of the miners. He said that as a delegation the miners were in support of East-West trade, but were compelled to vote against the resolution, because it asked for *unrestricted* world trade. He feared that this might mean the importation of cheap foreign coal into British markets! An ironic comment on the General Council's attitude was to be seen in the following day's *Daily Herald,* which on the same page as the Congress Report gave prominence to the economic talks in Washington, with the heading 'Britain demands unrestricted world trade'. It was the Foundry workers, therefore, who, in the *Daily Herald's* own showing were speaking for Britain.

The strikes of the E.T.U., taking place while Congress was in session, are the first skirmishes in the coming struggles which the British trade union movement will wage for more pay. The debate on wages was therefore expected as the most vital at Congress. But



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the stage-managers succeeded in squeezing it into the last half-hour or so of Thursday afternoon's proceedings. Carried unanimously, the resolution of the Post Office Engineers' Union rejected all wage restraint. It was immediately followed by another, forcefully moved by Mr. Stevens of the E.T.U., which tabled its opposition to wage restraint, but which at the same time asked Congress to support the 'efforts of the trade unions in defending the living standards of their members, by vigorously campaigning in favour of high wages'.

Speakers dealt with the loss in real wages suffered by the working class, particularly since the Tory Government. No one denied that industrial profits were running at record levels. But it was left to Mr. Deakin, on behalf of the General Council, to oppose the resolution by stating that it contained the 'economics of Bedlam'. Unfortunately for himself, Mr. Deakin has the habit of asking rhetorical questions. 'Profits!' he declared: 'Are there profits in coal?' To his surprise shouts of 'Yes!' came from the usually quiet miners' delegation. Undaunted he continued, 'Are there profits in transport?' From all over the hall came the yell, 'Yes!', even, to his chagrin, from the docile members of his own delegation. As sure as fate, the employers this winter will try to make every use of Mr. Deakin's platform orations. It is equally certain that, as the two-and-a-half million votes for the E.T.U. resolution showed, outside of Douglas the rank and file will determine for themselves whose are the Bedlamite economics.

The deep working-class feelings of hundreds of delegates were touched in the debate on the Tory Steel Board. The challenge to the General Council on the Standing Order introduced years ago to ban Keir Hardie as a delegate, and used this year to let Lincoln Evans in, set off a debate in which three million votes were cast against the General Council. The opposition would have been greater, had not some of the unions reserved their support for a milder resolution, subsequently withdrawn. 'Can you believe he will forget the working class?' asked a defender of Lincoln Evans. 'Remember Jimmy Thomas!' came the answer from many voices in the hall.

The block vote in no way reflects the narrow margins in the voting within a number of the largest delegations at Congress. The miners, for example, had over 120 delegates present. It was common knowledge at Douglas that on all major issues this delegation was almost equally divided, and that less than six miners voting for



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

progressive working-class policies would have presented a very different picture of Congress to the world. And all the time the leaders of the T.U.C. face an insoluble dilemma. Capitalism can no longer deliver the goods. British capitalism must wage war not only upon the rising spirit of the Colonial peoples, but upon its own working class. As a result, whilst Douglas might be seen from the platform as a series of successful manoeuvres, the working class in defending itself will be compelled to repudiate the policies of its leaders, who are out-Torying the Tories.

Douglas will be followed by the Labour Party Conference at Margate, where over 300 amendments to the official *Challenge to Britain* stand in the name of the rank-and-file of the Labour Party. If trade union branches, or district or area committees, were able to table resolutions direct to the T.U.C., what an agenda we should see! Meanwhile, the leadership of Congress seeks to place the British working class in pawn to a decaying capitalism. One thing alone keeps the precarious control of the movement in their hands —the continued disunity of the progressive militant forces. Shaken last year, the General Council spent the intervening months working hard preparing their confusing reports, marshalling their block votes, splitting the movement with their bans and proscriptions. But the rank-and-file expressed themselves on O'Brien's telegram to Churchill, on Lincoln Evans' £5,000 a year position, on Yankee domination, on the wage freeze, in terms that would never be permitted on the rostrum of the T.U.C. That rank and file, united in wage battles, united in its determination to clear the Tories out, can by that same unity sweep from leadership those friends of the Tories who sat on the front bench of the platform at Douglas. Working-class unity is the key which will resolve the contradictions of Douglas.

---

**A LABOUR MONTHLY SUBSCRIPTION**

*Some readers prefer to have their Labour Monthly delivered by post on the morning of publication date. The busy man or woman or the shift worker who cannot rely on being free to pick up the copy from the newsagent on the first day and later gets the answer 'Sold out', finds big advantages in having a postal subscription. It saves you trouble; it costs no more; and you get your copy on the dot. Consult your newsagent, or order from The Manager, Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3. Yearly 18s; half-yearly, 9s, post free. For subscription form see back cover.*



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# STRIKES IN FRANCE

PETER FRYER

*'The decisive fact of the hour is the progress of the idea of unity among the masses of the people'.*

Maurice Thorez, June 17, 1953.

FOR 22 days this August the working class of France, backed by the majority of the French people, fought the greatest strike their country has ever seen. This magnificent struggle of over four million workers, acting with an unprecedented unity and determination that struck fear into the hearts of their rulers, marked a major turning-point in the post-war history of France. It was at once the prelude to still greater events, which will almost certainly lead to the salvation of France—and the logical outcome of the decision taken by the French Government in April, 1947. In that month the Communist ministers, representing the party to which one Frenchman in three gives his vote, were forced out of office on American orders. From that time forward successive French governments tried to govern against the working class. France sank deeper and deeper into financial crisis, whose main cause is the crippling war in Indo-China. With a budget deficit of over £800 million, France is this year spending £1,276 million—33 per cent. of the total budget—on war. Government after government has sought to solve the mounting crisis at the expense of the ordinary people, whose resistance has been met with acts of repression like the arrest of working-class leaders and the clubbing and shooting-down of demonstrators.

While capitalist profits soared and tax evasion reached an average of 30 per cent. of all declared revenue, the standard of living of the working people fell to starvation level. Today one wage-earner in two receives less than 25,000 francs a month, and the purchasing power of wages is half what it was in 1938. In a situation where millions are striving desperately to make ends meet, the provocative poverty decrees of the millionaire premier Joseph Laniel had an inevitably explosive effect. They provided for the sacking of about 25,000 temporary civil servants and public employees; the addition of seven years to the retirement age; and the limitation of new recruitment to 75 per cent. of posts that fell vacant. Within three days of these decrees becoming known three million workers were out, demanding the withdrawal of the decrees, the recall of Parlia-



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment, and higher wages. A week later the government employees had been joined by hundreds of thousands of workers in private industry, who pressed their own wage demands as well as fighting in sympathy with the men and women directly affected by the decrees.

Of the many lies told by British and French reactionary newspapers about the strike the most absurd was the suggestion that somehow the C.G.T. (General Confederation of Labour), which organises four million workers, was taken by surprise. The C.G.T. was alleged to have floundered after the two other trade union federations—the 450,000-strong Socialist-led *Force Ouvriere* and the 700,000-strong Catholic-led C.F.T.C. (French Confederation of Christian Workers)—in an effort to capture the leadership of the movement from them. Nothing is further from the truth. Certainly far more workers were far angrier and far more ready to take strike action than anyone had foreseen. But it was the Bureau of the C.G.T. that first made a call to the workers to show their opposition to the special powers granted to Laniel by the National Assembly. It was the joint call of the C.G.T. and C.F.T.C. municipal workers' unions that brought out the municipal workers on August 4. Only the sheer pressure of their members forced the F.O. and C.F.T.C. national leaderships to put up some kind of fight. And when they entered into the separate agreement with Laniel and betrayed the movement, the vast majority of their own members remained on strike for five more days, and went back only when the C.G.T. advised them to do so.

The whole strike was marked by tremendous unity and a remarkable fighting spirit. Thousands of united action committees sprang up in the factories and pits, comprising members of all three federations and of various independent unions. Political, trade union and religious differences were forgotten in the course of the fight. The enthusiasm, energy and creative initiative of rank and file Frenchmen and Frenchwomen translated itself into the highly efficient organisation of picket lines, daily mass meetings, demonstrations, leaflet distribution, deputations to demand the recall of Parliament, collections among small shopkeepers, the bringing out of strike bulletins, and so forth. Catholics who had cold-shouldered Communists, Communists who had eyed Socialists askance, found themselves pulling together in a common effort that transcended sectional differences. Nothing like it had been seen since the Resistance.

Though the 1936 strikes took place in a completely different situation, following the electoral victory of the Popular Front, the



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

expression 'The wind of 1936 is blowing again' was to be heard on the lips of many of the strikers. This was the best precedent they could find for the spirit that gripped them, that made it easy to bear hunger, hardships and sacrifices lightly, to defy arrest and imprisonment. Moving among strikers, many of whom were unorganised—the type all too often written off as 'backward'—you felt as though a giant was being roused from slumber. Men, women and young people were coming alive. In many factories a mere handful of trade unionists, or even one isolated member, brought out their workmates, and then recruited them in scores and hundreds. To be recognised as British and sympathetic to the strike was to be surrounded by dozens of eager questioners, pathetically anxious to know how the solidarity movement was developing in Britain, and to say 'thank you' for the Electrical Trades Union donation of £1,000. It is impossible to estimate how much that donation did for Anglo-French friendship.

At the decisive moment of the strike, when victory was in sight, the leaders of the F.O. and the C.F.T.C. betrayed the movement. It was a classical betrayal, almost a text-book exposure of the splitting role of the right wing. It was an action by men who had lost all sense of shame, who had dropped all pretence of loyalty to the workers they claim to lead. Their separate agreement with the Government was at the same time a failure and a success. Though seized on by the Press ('End of the strikes' was one headline—five days premature!) it largely failed in its aim of sowing confusion and shattering the strikers' unity. The few who did follow the F.O. and C.F.T.C. lead soon found that the agreement was not worth the paper it was written on, for the 'no sanctions against strikers' clause was freely violated by the railway authorities. However, the vast majority of the strikers did not put the agreement to the test. They stood as firm as a rock. The instinctive reaction of the rank and file was strikingly similar to the reaction of the Stourbridge workers when the T.U.C. General Council betrayed the 1926 General Strike: 'Double the pickets'. Angry delegations went from all over Paris to the F.O. and C.F.T.C. headquarters; membership cards of these federations were torn up, and many ripped badges from their lapels and trampled on them.

But if the splitters failed to break the strike, they did succeed in propping up the tottering Laniel Government, and in preventing the strike from having certain political results that had begun to seem almost inevitable. While the mass of the strikers entered the fight without any political aims, the strike was exerting increasing



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressure for the recall of the National Assembly. The fall of Laniel and the election of a Centre-Left type of government was practically certain. Such a government would have been more susceptible to mass pressure. With a developing mass movement, still further political changes were not to be ruled out. But the separate agreement gave the ruling class just the relief it needed for the pro-Laniel majority in the Bureau of the National Assembly to refuse the demand of 211 deputies (two more than legally necessary) for the recall of Parliament. This it did by declaring that the signatures of four Communist Deputies were invalid. For the time being Laniel and his decrees were saved. To have continued the strike at this stage would have meant losing the sympathy of the population, and endangering the unity that had been built up. It would have been a harsh, long-drawn-out and probably inconclusive struggle. For the sake of preserving unity the C.G.T. decided to call on the workers to return to work. Many did so with extreme reluctance. But the C.G.T. call was followed. The workers went back united, and straight away began preparing for the next round.

The French strikes were in no sense defeated. Some wage increases were won, and the movement undoubtedly helped to secure the release of Alain Le Leap, secretary of the C.G.T. and the four other imprisoned working-class leaders. Nor is there the least doubt that there will be a new upsurge of the movement before long. Things cannot go on as they are in France. Though a ten per cent. reduction in meat prices has been announced with a blare of trumpets, there is no guarantee whatever that this will not fizzle out as did the previous price decrease campaigns of Blum, Moch and Pinay. In fact, an effort has simply been made to prevent the price index from reaching in September the figure of 149.1, at which the wages sliding scale would operate. The Higher Commission of Collective Agreements, the body which advises the government on economic matters, may thus meet with easy minds—and prices can continue to soar in October. The problems remain, and will grow more acute with every month that passes. Only radical measures can solve them.

The main conclusion to be drawn from the August strikes is that the French workers have achieved an exceptional unity. The strike had the effect of flinging down all the artificial barriers between workers of different opinions. In three weeks there came about the greatest development of united working-class action in any Western European country since the end of the war. The end of the strike did not mean the end of this unity. The united committees remain



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in existence; they are being strengthened; new ones are being built. Having forged the weapon of unity the workers are perfecting it in preparation for future struggles. *Le Monde* admitted on September 8, that the C.G.T. policy of 'the outstretched hand' towards the other workers had met with success in the majority of industries, and added that the C.G.T.'s prestige had been 'perceptibly strengthened'. This is because of the stress it laid throughout the strike on the building of unity in action. The workers feel instinctively that this unity corresponds to their present and future interests. The day is not far distant when a united working class, building on the foundations laid in August, 1953, will compel far-reaching political changes.

---

## FROM THE *LABOUR MONTHLY* OF 25 YEARS AGO

# THE MONDIST CONGRESS, 1928*

It is not, however, sufficient merely to condemn the Congress and its proceedings; it is necessary to analyse its composition, methods, machinery, and objectives, and then out of this examination, determine what steps must be taken by those concerned to build up in Britain a real and effective workers' instrument of struggle. . . . The membership of the Unions has little or nothing to do with the decisions arrived at in the delegations or the Congress, and the sooner this is understood the better, so as to permit a proper estimation of the decisions already arrived at, and to prepare for the changing of this deplorable condition of affairs. . . . Everything is fixed and arranged between the officials of the Unions within the particular trade groups, and the Congress merely endorses decisions already arrived at, and to which there is no alternative, with the consequence that the Trades Union Congress selection of General Council members is a farce. The alternative to this is to permit a Congress composed of delegates selected in virtue of their policy by the membership of the Unions, to elect the Council year by year from nominations made from delegates to the Congress. . . . When one, therefore, faces the happenings at the Swansea Congress with this information concerning its composition and methods, there is not the same reason for surprise at anything which is done, nor the same reason to come to the conclusion that all is lost because the delegations arrived at reactionary and even treacherous decisions. This conception which is substantiated by the facts, enables all active working-class fighters to see in events at Swansea, not the end of a fight but only the beginning of a struggle.

From *The T.U.C. and the Future of Trade Unionism*, by Arthur Horner, October, 1928.

*Mondism, or the policy of class collaboration, as proposed by the employers headed by Sir Alfred Mond, was adopted by the Trades Union Congress at Swansea in September, 1928. The Mond-Turner Committee was set up. Later, when Mondism had served its purpose, it was dropped—by the employers.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# ONCE MORE ON RICARDO*

R. PAGE ARNOT

THERE was an old saying of the country-folk: 'May the Thames flow through the Houses of Parliament and may the honest members swim'. This old saying or curse, however relevant it might seem to some at the present day, was uttered in an earlier period before the rigidities of the two-party system. In those times of the Whigs and Tories the party ties were looser and a non-party reformer, if possessed of sufficient means, could buy his way into parliament. So could and did many a rascal. The forms of electoral corruption, very different from those of today, were open and blatant. But the purchase of a seat in the Commons through a 'rotten borough'—was hardly considered to be a corrupt practice at all, compared with the bribery of a contested election, such as Dickens described in the constituency of Eatanswill. On the contrary it was an ordinary transaction between buyer and seller, though with much preliminary haggling over the price. Parliamentary seats, for those who desired them, were in the open market—not the black market which came later in the nineteenth century. It was under these conditions that James Mill (friend of Jeremy Bentham and father of John Stuart Mill) bluntly described the members of parliament as 'plunderers of the people', saying of the type:—

> When the man who is hunting after a share in the plunder of the people, adopts a set of opinions calculated to recommend him to those in whose hands is the division of the spoil, opinions the fruit of which would be to exclude good government, that is human happiness, from the face of the earth, I may not doubt the reality of his belief, but I well know from what fountain it is derived. The wish in most minds goes three parts in four to the procreation of the belief.
>
> (Letter to Ricardo, August 23, 1815.)

Mill therefore in the same letter urged his friend Ricardo (two years before the *Principles of Political Economy* was published) to enter the House of Commons. Mill had first touched on this a year earlier and he now wrote:—

> You now can have no excuse for not going into parliament, and doing what you can to improve that most imperfect instrument of government.

*THE WORKS AND CORRESPONDENCE OF DAVID RICARDO. Edited by Piero Sraffa with the collaboration of M. H. Dobb. Vol. V: Speeches and Evidence. Vol. VI: Letters 1810-1815. Vol. VII: Letters 1816-1818. Vol. VIII: Letters 1819-1821. Vol. IX: Letters 1821-1823. (Cambridge University Press.) 24s. each volume.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> On all subjects of political economy, you will have no match; and you express yourself on those subjects so correctly, and so clearly, that in a short time you would be a very instructive and a very impressive speaker. . . .

Ricardo, while admitting that 'there are many venal men in Parliament who get there with no other view but to forward their own personal ends' thought his friend was 'unjustly severe'. In any case, however,

> your parliamentary scheme is above all others unfit for me—my inclination does not in the least point that way. Speak indeed! I could not, I am sure, utter three sentences coherently.
>
> (Ricardo to Mill, August 30, 1815.)

Mill in reply, while not urging Ricardo further at that moment, repeated his opinions, saying, 'I arrived at them slowly, and unwillingly myself; and so will you', and then returned to the charge against the members of parliament.

> For their *venality*, read Windham's speech against reform—not an occasion where you would expect to find the baseness of the great unnecessarily brought forward; and you will find him describing the rapacity of the members of the two houses—their insatiable, unprincipled desire to live at the expense of the public, to plunder the people for money which they may spend, in language which if I were to strive to surpass it in strength, it would be altogether out of my power.
>
> (Mill to Ricardo, October 10, 1815.)

After a twelvemonth, Mill was again urging Ricardo to secure a seat. But, Ricardo having a month later promptly refused an invitation to contest Worcester, Mill wrote saying:

> I coincide with your judgment, as I do in almost all things else, in your declining Worcester. If I were in your situation, the rottenest Borough I could find would be my market, with nothing to do but to part with a sum of money. I am, however, very much in earnest that you should be in parliament.
>
> (Mill to Ricardo, December 16, 1816.)

Again Ricardo would not fall in with Mill's suggestion that he should get a seat in parliament, saying 'I fear I should be mere lumber there'. (December 20, 1816). Ricardo's modesty was such that he was always doubtful of Mill's assurances of the success that would attend the publication of his *Principles of Political Economy*. But the success of that book and the persuasion of his friends brought him at last to the point of allowing negotiations for a seat to be begun. The negotiations were carried through by his land agent: the bankrupt and dissolute Irish nobleman, the Earl of Portarlington, was willing to sell the seat that bore his name for



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sum of £4,000 plus a loan of £25,000 secured on his estates. This sum was reached after some haggling by the agents of the two parties. Into this simple money matter, this market transaction about the price of a seat in parliament, there came the unwelcome intrusion of politics. All was going along smoothly when the earl's agent unexpectedly asked if Ricardo in parliament would support the Ministers. On Ricardo's agent replying indignantly that 'politics must not be named—but perfect freedom', the negotiations dropped. There is an 'Alice in Wonderland' logic about this episode.

Eventually the matter went through: the sitting member resigned and Ricardo entered parliament in February, 1819, and remained a member till his early death in September, 1823. There he was listened to with keen attention on all economic and financial questions, while his general standpoint as a bourgeois radical was shown by his attitude against the 'Six Acts'; for investigation into the Peterloo massacre and for Catholic emancipation. A year earlier he had written 'I should neither be Whig nor Tory but should be anxiously desirous of promoting every measure which should give us a chance of good government. This I think will never be obtained without a reform in parliament'.

The parliamentary speeches and activities of Ricardo, of great interest to students of economic history, show how far he was able to apply his theoretical principles to the varied practical issues that came up for discussion in the Commons. They can be read in the fifth volume of this edition, which includes in its admirable footnotes contemporary comments. For example there is Cobbett's denunciation of the *Principles* as 'a heap of senseless, Change-Alley jargon, put upon paper and bound up into book'. Or again there is Ricardo's kindly attitude to Robert Owen whom nevertheless he finally regarded as 'a visionary': for Ricardo in parliament was never more than a moderate bourgeois Radical.

The greatest interest, however, is in the Letters. These, as is shown in the introductions to volumes one and six, enable the reader to follow Ricardo's evolving thought, as he expresses it to his main correspondents. Of particular theoretical interest are those which illuminate whatever had appeared obscure and dispose of the legend that Ricardo had retreated from his labour theory of value. Thus the Letter to Mill of December 28, 1818, makes plain the exact nature of his criticism of Adam Smith regarding value and prices of production. It clears up what commentators at the time and vulgar economists since had regarded as the 'great contradic-



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion' in Ricardo's Chapter One—parallel to the 'great contradiction' which commentators of the same kidney alleged to exist between Volume One and Volume Three of Marx's *Capital*. This (together with the letters of October 9, 1820, and January 25, 1821) removes also one of the props of the legend that Ricardo watered down his 'primitive' labour theory until in his third edition he substituted for it virtually the 'adding-up theory' of Smith and Marshall. The whole of the letters to James Mill (whose fame may one day rest more securely on his being 'the onlie begetter' of Ricardo's classic than on his parenthood of John Stuart Mill or his authorship of *The History of British India*) are of great interest and, between 1815 and 1817 show the stages and method in the writing of the *Principles*. The correspondence with Malthus at the end of 1814 and in 1815 lays bare the root of their differences on value e.g. on whether an expansion of demand or of trade can increase profits, as distinct from a change in the value of corn and hence in the value of labour-power. They also show the steps by which Ricardo reaches the views in the *Essay on Profits* of 1815, with its proposition that a rise of wages does *not* raise the prices of commodities. For commodities he holds are determined solely by the amount of labour required to produce them, compared to the amount of labour required to produce an ounce of gold. This it seems was the crucial unifying step in Ricardo's thought: from his early and crude surplus-theory (expressed on a farm in the proportion of corn produced to corn fed to workers as subsistence) he reached a synthesis wherein he combined a theory of value, a theory of money and the practical corollary (which knocked out Smith's adding-up theory of price) about the effect of wages on prices.

Ricardo's unfinished paper, here printed in Volume IV for the first time, on *Absolute Value and Exchangeable Value,* may be taken along with his correspondence with Malthus on the Measure of Value in the summer of 1823. Contrary to the legend of 'weakening', this proves Ricardo's return to the matter at the end of his life, as well as showing the incomplete state in which he left this problem. This correspondence closes with a letter of August 31, 1823 (given in facsimile at the end of Volume IX). The letter, dramatically enough, opens with the words 'I have only a few words more to say on the subject of value, and I have done'. It was the last letter: within a few days Ricardo was stricken with his fatal illness. The problem which he left unsolved had to wait another generation for Marx to find the solution.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# RANK-AND-FILE COMMENT

*(Last month we printed some of the many interesting communications we received from members of the Labour Party on the official draft policy document 'Challenge to Britain'. This month we print some further extracts expressing the views of active Labour Party people, many of them holding official positions in their local organisations.—Ed., L.M.)*

**Lancashire Trade Union organiser:**

'Challenge to Britain' is milk and water socialism and right-wing reaction fused. Jim Figgins puts his finger on the complete negation of socialist policy when he draws attention to the sacrifices demanded, without attack on rent, interest and profit. Surely the foundation of a socialist society is to attack and abolish rent and profit and interest? This 'Challenge' is clearly in line with the philosophy of the T.U. and Labour Party leaders; I see little difference between them and their policy, and those leaders of the 1926-1930 era—same policy, same result!

The defeat in 1951 was not due to great hope offered by the Tories, but was the lack of a socialist policy. The hamstringing of our resources by being completely dominated by America and the entry into a reactionary war in Korea was the beginning of the end of a cowardly policy, originated by Ernest Bevin in his hate of the U.S.S.R. The results of by-elections since, have proved the electorate are still not convinced the Labour Party will bring peace and hope.

The present policy is a complete disregard of the policy agreed to at Morecambe by a leadership that pours scorn on the wishes of the rank and file; a leadership that supports American reaction, supports Syngman Rhee, that jailed dockers for striking, and used troops to break strikes. A so-called people's party that restrains wages, while profits reach an all-high level. We lack homes, schools, clinics, hospitals, nurseries because we have a crippling rearmament programme. We are screamed at to increase production by T.U. leaders, Labour leaders, Tory leaders, Radio and Press and every means of propaganda, and despite the fact that we have increased production the standards of the workers have receded. Our youngsters are losing the opportunity of adequate training in commerce and industry and are dragged into the services and involved in punitive wars on the people of Kenya and Malaya. The markets and trading facilities of Russia, China, Poland and other Eastern European countries that would help us considerably are rejected as a result of American domination originally given wholehearted support by Bevin and carried on by Morrison, and later by the Tory Government. The Labour Government carried out a Tory Foreign policy, with its catastrophic consequences on Home affairs.

The easing of tension can and will be achieved when the British Labour movement adopt a socialist attitude. If this country told the American Government that it was no longer blindly adhering to U.S. policy and entered into trade talks and agreements with the East European countries other countries would follow suit. If and when the Trade Union Congress wakes up and realises their leaders have betrayed the world working class by dividing the organised workers, and force their leaders (or a new leader-



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ship) to enter into talks and working arrangements with the World Federation of Trade Unions, a new confidence among peoples will arise. Honest trading relations will pave the way for honest and peaceful international relations, and with an honest and decent European leadership the stable character in French and Italian politics will come to the top. America will dislike this movement, but she will have to face up and collaborate or become isolated. Her dominance and power will recede with these circumstances, and as the American people awake to the danger of their warmongering leaders.

Peace can be won. Britain can play a terrific part in the struggle it's up to all of us to play our part vigorously and fearlessly and force our leaders to take the initiative in opening world talks on trade and peace.

**Sussex Constituency Party Chairman:**

I am very disappointed with 'Challenge to Britain'. It lacks all the three things which I consider most important: first—Foreign policy; second—subservience to America; third—set-up under Nationalisation.

**Yorkshire Alderman:**

Our domestic policy is entirely dependent upon foreign policy. We must get back to original fundamental policy of the Labour Party, i.e. international brotherhood and understanding and peace by negotiation.

**Lancashire Trades Council Delegate:**

Our statement on the Cold War has been worded in assumption—an erroneous assumption, that Russia is our potential enemy. While the national E.C. is willing to concede to American pressure in regards to a divided world, we can never gain independence; nor is there hope of an improved standard of life for the worker—surely the two most desired ends, or should I say, beginning, for a Socialist organisation. Internally our trouble is the reactionary trade union leaders. They are the real barrier to progress, are these union officials who to a great degree, pull all the main strings in Transport House. Our first job is to gain power within our own unions. In some cases, the constitution is such that it is virtually impossible to wrench the power away from present officials, without firstly altering the constitution—this must be done before we can move forward.

**Yorkshire:**

My experiences have been much the same as those described in Mrs. Mattison's article, and I think the Labour Party's attitude to the World Peace Movement is completely wrong. In my view 'Challenge to Britain' is weak and does not go nearly far enough and is not likely to win the next election. I do not think home and foreign policy can be separated.

**Surrey:**

The new Socialist policy is not facing up to the real issue of wages and prices. Foreign policy must be carried out more for the people in the country concerned, as our home policy must cater more for the workers. We must work hard in U.N.O.: press for more East-West trade; and a World Parliament.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

**Warwickshire:**

I do feel very strongly about the need for Peace. If Peace can be maintained there is no doubt that Capitalism will crumble all the more quickly which leads me on to the 'Challenge to Britain'. I feel that all policy must centre around foreign policy; in the pamphlet this is missing altogether. So where is the challenge? Some of the rank and file members of the Labour Party are hoping to bring about a real Socialist foreign policy which would not only be a Challenge to Britain but to the whole capitalist world.

**Cornwall:**

Home and foreign policy must be integrated; one cannot succeed if the other fails. To ease international tension we must formulate a constructive foreign policy and keep free from American domination to the largest possible extent.

**Gloucestershire:**

From meetings that I have attended on Challenge to Britain, I have not come across one person who has said that he is satisfied with it. The only good thing to come out of it all has been the high level of discussions centring around it. The document will hinder rather than help Labour at the next election—unless it is drastically revised (or better still thrown out) at annual conference. Unless the Labour Party seizes the initiative in foreign affairs and goes forward with a genuine peace policy—then Labour need not bother to fight any more elections and Challenge to Britain will be as dead as the Dodo!

---

**Communication:**

*In connection with our reprinting of Lenin's article on the fortieth anniversary of the death of Harry Quelch, we have received a letter from his son Tom Quelch in which, after conveying his appreciation, he makes the factual correction given below.—Ed., L.M.*

There is a mistake in Lenin's article which should be corrected. He says: 'The London Society of Compositors more than once elected him its Chairman. . . .' This is an error which any older member of the L.S.C. would realise. My father was not a compositor. The L.S.C. was and is a close craft union. Having been a member myself I know. My father was a member of the old Printers' Warehousemen and Cutters Union and played a leading part in its affairs. (It was absorbed into the present National Union of Printing, Bookbinding and Paper Workers.) He was Trustee of his Union, and as Lenin says, presided over many of its meetings. Indeed, my father devoted considerable effort towards organising the unorganised printing workers in his Union and N.A.T.S.O.P.A. Lenin, of course, could not be aware of the number of unions in the printing trades, but he would know of this trade union endeavour.

There were many active comrades belonging to the Social Democratic Federation who were prominent in Printing Trades Unionism—Harry Hobart, C. F. Davies, Fred Knee and A. E. Holmes in the L.S.C. for instance; Alf Evans, Charlie Jones, E. W. Spackman and others in the Printers' Warehousemen, and so on.



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

## Book Review

### BYZANTIUM

*Byzantium into Europe*, by Jack Lindsay. (485 pp. The Bodley Head. *37s. 6d.*)

SINCE the days of Edward Gibbon, English scholars have been to the forefront in studying the history of the East Roman or Byzantine Empire. Yet until recently interest in their work and its significance was confined to a narrow circle of specialists. Today all that is changed. Pelican Books publish a work on Justinian and his Age; the Third Programme commemorates the five hundredth anniversary of the capture of Constantinople by the Turks with a special series of talks; new books on Byzantium by Baynes and Moss, Runciman, Vasiliev, appear every few months.

There is nothing fortuitous in this renewal of interest. Men turn to study the record of the past because they find it relevant to the problems of the present. This is not to say that we should seek in history simple parallels and ready-made solutions. In fact this is just the kind of use made of Byzantine history today by the commercial travellers in cold war. Professor Toynbee and his adherents—many of whom are better classified as publicists than as historians—project back into their study of Byzantium the prejudices and hatreds with which they view the world of today, and in so doing forge a respectable intellectual pedigree for these feelings. Others are ready to make a different evaluation: in a recent number of *History Today* Constantinople in its last days of independence was compared to West Berlin—possibly the worst similitude in all history, if we may misquote Macaulay.

Mr. Lindsay's book is both a product of the new interest in Byzantium and a corrective to some of its most publicised manifestations. Its central thesis is that the very dissimilar courses of events in the early Middle Ages in Western Europe and in the Byzantine Empire were both part of a single historical process, the formation and development of feudal relations of production. In that process the leading role was played by Byzantium. In East and West alike the new stage was reached because the mass of the people resisted old methods of exploitation; in both alike the motive force of developments in the middle ages is the clash of interest between the primary producers and the feudal landlords, who fought to maintain their right to exploit; only at the very end of the period do their paths diverge, as the earliest forms of capitalist relations of production make their appearance in Western Europe. The Byzantine Empire is profoundly misunderstood by those who see in it nothing but a static, authoritarian, theocratic dictatorship.

These somewhat general arguments are supported by a rich mass of evidence, vividly and sympathetically presented. Much of this will be new to all but specialist scholars: e.g., the connection between the Reformation in Western Europe and the various heretical movements in the Byzantine Empire which were the vehicles of resistance to feudal oppression; the importance of Byzantium as originator or transmitter of techniques of production fundamental to the great advance of science after the Renaissance; the debt of European music to Byzantium, and through it to Syria.

Just because Mr. Lindsay has cast his net so wide, and has ventured with it into waters hitherto the preserve of a few professional experts, he occasionally serves us



PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

up obscurities or half-truths. Was Justinian's empire in the sixth century a feudal state formation or not? Mr. Lindsay dodges the issue, but he dodges it in good company, for historians of the ancient world and of the Middle Ages in so far as they ask the question at all, are sharply at variance on the answer. In general he is, by qualification and taste, more at home in the superstructure of law and political theory, art and science, than in the basic questions of economic relations. Indeed, he has overlooked some of the evidence he could have obtained from historians of land tenure and numismatists.

These shortcomings are of little account, however, beside the solid merits of his book. It is always captivating and thought-provoking. And it is written in the conviction that the world is one, that ideas and merchandise and men have always contrived to pass across the boundaries with which interested parties have sought to divide them, and that civilisation can be neither built nor maintained without contributions from all peoples and all lands. Anyone who is interested in how we came to be what we are, and who is prepared to see some of the ideas he acquired at school thoroughly shaken up, will enjoy Mr. Lindsay's book. And specialists should beware against being put off by it just because it forces them to re-examine so many of their assumptions.

ROBERT BROWNING

## CONTENTS OF PREVIOUS NUMBERS IN 1953


APRIL (Stalin Memorial Number): *Stalin and the Future*, R.P.D.; *Tributes to Stalin*, I J. Nehru, II D. N. Pritt, Q.C., III William Gallacher; *Stalin's Legacy*, James Klugmann; *The General Strike*, 1926, J. V. Stalin; *Mr. Eden Kow-Tows*, Quæstor; *Cold War Against Britain*, Cmdr. E. P. Young, R.N. (Ret'd.); BOOK REVIEWS: *America Over Britain* (P. Bolsover); *Brother Bill McKie*, (Philip Bonsky); *Quakers Visit Russia* (Kathleen Lonsdale, F.R.S.); *England in the Late Middle Ages* (A. R. Myers); *England in the 17th Century* (M. Ashley); reviewed by J. B. Figgins, W. Gallacher, A.R., L. F. Marks, A.L.M.

MAY: *D-Day for Peace*, R.P.D.; *May Day and the Fight for Peace*, J. B. Figgins; *Calendar of Peace Moves*, Quæstor; *Francois Rabelais*, T. A. Jackson; *Violence in America*, George Hardy; *An Epic Story*, William Gallacher; *The General Strike*, 1926 (II), J. V. Stalin; BOOK REVIEWS: *That's Why I Went* (Monica Felton); *Betrayed Spring* (Jack Lindsay); *Problems of Nationalized Industry* (W. A. Robson); *Rumanian Summer* (J. Lindsay and M. Cornforth); *Not Like This* (Jane Walsh); *Sociology of Communism* (J. Monnerot); reviewed by D. N. Pritt, Q.C., J. Mahon, W. Hannington, P.J.W., B. Marks, T.A.J.

JUNE: *Britain's Hour*, R.P.D.; *Africa, Africa!* Derek Kartun; *On The Razor's Edge*, Ivor Montagu; *Does Peace Mean Slump?* John Eaton; *An Old Superstition, A New Disgrace*, William Morris; *Churches in Eastern Europe*, Rev. Stanley Evans. BOOK REVIEWS: *History of The Times Vol. IV; China's New Creative Age* (Hewlett Johnson); *Koje Unscreened* (Burchett & Winnington); *The Revolutionary Movement in France* (J. Plamenatz); reviewed by R.P.D., Monica Felton, D. N. Pritt, Q.C.; H.R.J.

JULY: *The New Labour Programme*, R.P.D.; *Sir Lincoln Evans and All That*, Wal Hannington; *The Artist and the Working-Class Movement*, Paul Hogarth; *Calendar of War or Peace*, Quæstor; *Open Letter to My M.P.*, Andrew Condron (Royal Marines); *McCarthyism in Britain?* Christopher Meredith; BOOK REVIEWS: *Who Killed Kenya?* (C. Willis); *Gold Coast Revolution* (G. Padmore); *Children in the British Colonies; Solo Trumpet* (T. A. Jackson); *The Volunteers* (Steve Nelson); reviewed by Desmond Buckle; Bob Stewart; E. Edney.

AUGUST: *Dangers of Delay*, by R.P.D.; *Challenge to Britain*, J. B. Figgins; *A Veteran's Voice for Peace*, Florence Mattison; *Beasts Gone Mad*, Jean-Paul Sartre; *Old Fallacies for New*, Andrew Rothstein; *Italy*, J. Platts-Mills; *Two Health Services*, Dr. Amrit Kaur; *'The Empire'*, William Gallacher. BOOK REVIEWS: *China Stands Up* (R. K. Karanjia); *Russia's Lomonosov* (B. N. Menshutkin); *Defiant People* (Paul Hogarth); reviewed by V. Penn, E. H. S. Burhop, R. T. F. Turner.

SEPTEMBER: *Douglas and Margate*, R.P.D.; *The Great Opportunity*, D. N. Pritt, Q.C.; *Nationalisation*, F. L. Haxell; *Put the Children First*, G. C. T. Giles; *Old Fallacies for New II*, Andrew Rothstein; *What They Chose to Forget about Hilaire Belloc*, R. Page Arnot; *Harry Quelch*, V. I. Lenin. BOOK REVIEWS: *Yo Banfa!* (Rewi Alley); *Soviet Civilisation* (Corliss Lamont); reviewed by M. Parrish, J. Todd.



Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.





PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Nicola Vaptsarov with extracts from his poems: couldn't it be done for other inspiring figures?' It is valuable to be told what articles readers do and don't approve: one objects to the article on The Rosenbergs by the distinguished French writer Jean-Paul Sartre, describing it as 'almost pathological in tone'. In fairness I should add that he was alone in voicing disapproval of what others found 'extremely moving', 'magnificent', 'very impressive'; and described as 'the second "J'Accuse" to come out of France' (recalling Zola's historic defence of the persecuted Dreyfus.)

A general criticism came from a Labour Party correspondent in Middlesex: 'The lay-out is not attractive and does not *look* interesting; articles are too heavy and profound. I have passed it round my own staff, quite average chaps—good union and Party workers and supporters, although not all active. Quite frankly, it went right over their heads in most cases; but that is the type you have to cater for. Sorry if my remarks appear too critical, but I've long been concerned at the lack of any publication that would attract and interest the average working man.' In the same post a letter comes from Essex, ordering a specimen copy for a young woodworker. Also a member of the Labour Party, he writes: 'Your magazine is worthy of a much greater industrial circulation. Its fundamental approach to industrial and national problems is one of the surest ways of political education for the industrial worker. The clarity of the exposition, supported by the statistical evidence, must prove conclusive'. He goes on to say that if the whole movement were armed with this outlook, 'the economic tangle in our national life today would have been averted, and the basis for the construction of a socialist economy well and truly laid. But the footings are in, and whilst there is no lack of young people eager to understand and absorb Marxism, the ultimate achievement of socialism is assured.' Perhaps, after all, these two correspondents' views are not so far apart, although their emphasis is different. I think the point here is that *L.M.* is designed *primarily* for those men and women who already are the keenest workers in their trade union and political organisation—for the active, thinking people who are already interested in politics and active in the movement, accustomed to political reading, discussion and argument.

Donations received during August totalled:

# £47 9s. 0d.

REGULAR CONTRIBUTIONS came from: J. Tuckett, 5s.; 'Billie', 'in memory of Lewis Jones', 1s.; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s.; J.H., 'Ipswich', 5s.; P.O'H., 'Dublin', 2s.; 'New York', 7s.: 'Red Sergeant', 2s. 6d.; 'Jon', 10s.; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; D. H. Strathern and Friends (pre-paid): M. Philibert, 10s.; D. Rees, 10s.; D. M. Clarke, 10s.; R. McLeod, £1; B. Waters, 6s.; O. Greene, £2; E. D. McCallum, 5s.; A.W.K., £9 2s.; Royston Green, 3s. 6d.; 'L'Humanite', 3s.; H. Tinkler, 5s.; Tam O'Shanter and Grey Mare, 10s.; S. Mill, 10s.; H.G.B., 2s.; S. Morrissy, 10s.: E.J.B., 10s.; P. N. Brinson, 10s.; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d.; The Humphreys Family, 4s.; A.D. (Canada), £2.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: J. J. Murphy, £1 2s.; M. Darby, 2s.; 'Anon', £4 2s.: H. Braun, 1s. 5d.; A. J. Salmon, 1s.; A. Chesterton, 10s.; R. D. Manning, 12s.; G. McCulloch, 1s.; W. Winsch, 5s.; J. T. McGinn, 16s. 6d.; J. F. Shine, 5s.; 'Koba', 7s.; 'East-West Trade' (Canada), 7s. 1d.; A. D. Hazlewood, 2s.; A. A. Wills, 7s.: J. McLeod, 7s.; A. Hampton, 3s.; R. Brown, 1s.; G. Driver, 14s.; E. Whelan, £1 4s.; J. Bacon, 3s.; W. E. Durrant, 1s.; S. D. Humphries, 2s.: Anon, 'Birkenhead', 10s.; J. McWean, 3s.; A. Perkins, 12s.; R. G. Cragg, 4s.; G. Mearns, 2s.; J. Duffy, 12s.; J. Rubinstein, 3s.; R. Southern, 10s.; B.W.H. (U.S.A), £2 9s.; V.L.G. (U.S.A.), £2 13s. 6d.; 'Personal Greeting from U.S.A.', £5; S.A., 3s.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No.: L99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST ?

*Here's the Subscription Form:*

NAME.....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I wish to become a postal subscriber and enclose 18s. (home) $3.00 (U.S.A. and Canada), 19s. (elsewhere) for a year, beginning with the.....issue.

(SIGNED).....

**To LABOUR MONTHLY**
**134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3**

# Labour Monthly Bound Volume 1952

*It's a history of the year and a permanent record*

**ORDER NOW**

From your usual newsagents price **£1 5s. 0d.**, or

**THE MANAGER**
**134, BALLARDS LANE**
**LONDON, N.3**

## NATIONAL GUARDIAN

**The Progressive Newsweekly**

Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement

Edited by CEDRIC BELFRAGE

*Annual Subscription 24s.*

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1.

## LABOUR RESEARCH

October issue includes :

" The Case Against De-rating "
" National Income "
" Poverty in Nyasaland "

Monthly 9d. ; p.a., 10s. 6d.
LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
2, Soho Square, London, W.1.

## FOR SPECIMEN COPIES

Please send a free specimen copy to :—

(1) Name .....
Address.....
(2) Name .....
Address.....

You may mention my name, or/I enclose note to be sent on.

Signed.....
Address .....
.....

**TO THE MANAGER, 134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3**


PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED